UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,750	09/22/2003	David J. Lillie	03SW198/ALBRP318US	1899

7590   03/15/2006

Susan M. Donahue
Rockwell Automation
704-P, IP Department
1201 South 2nd Street
Milwaukee, WI 53204

EXAMINER
STACE, BRENT S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2161	

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>22 September 2003</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-39</u> is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) <u>26-32</u> is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on <u>22 September 2003</u> is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20060306</u>.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1.   Claims 1-39 have been examined. Claims 1-39 have been rejected. This document is the first Office action on the merits.

Information Disclosure Statement

2.   The information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner. The examiner would like to note informalities with the submitted IDS's. The IDS dated Aug 19th, 2004 lists a reference 2004/0017977 (Vering et al.). It was discovered that this is not a known inventor of this Publication, and this publication had little relevance to the claimed invention. However, in doing an inventor search the examiner discovered 2004/0019799 that appears to be what the applicant intended to be on the IDS since it is substantially more relevant than the reference on the IDS has shares the other correct information on the IDS. Also, the IDS dated Dec. 14th, 2004 lists only invalid document numbers. The examiner discovered that all the document numbers were missing a leading 0 (after the first 4 numbers indicating the publication year) that apparently carried over from the EPO search report that the IDS appears to be based from.

Specification

3.   The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

specification.

Drawings

4.   The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5)

because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the

description: 520_1-520_4. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d)

are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any

amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the

immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each

drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top

margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If

the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and

informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the

drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5.   Since the lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to

determine the presence of all possible minor errors, Applicant's cooperation is

requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the

drawings. For example, the drawings should be carefully checked to ensure that all

reference numerals are described in the specification, that no one reference numeral describes two separate drawing elements, or that the specification contains no reference to numerals not in the drawings.

Claim Objections

6.   Claims 26-32 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a.   Claim 26 recites "...based on a user role defining the portal configuration..." on lines 4-5. By the indentation suggested by the claim, this appears to be two different limitations, however correct punctuation is missing to separate the limitations. This objection propagates downward through the dependant Claims 27-32.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8.   Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

9.   Claim 9 recites "and/or," which renders the claim indefinite since it is unclear what the claim is claiming (e.g. "and" and "or," just "and," or just "or").

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

10.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

> Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

11.   Claims 34-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 34 contains functional descriptive material, however the functional descriptive material can not be realized since it is not stored on a computer readable medium. This rebjection propagates downward through the dependant Claims 35-39.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

12.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

13.   Claims 1-4, 8-14, 16, 17, 20-22, 24, 26-28, and 30-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) and 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.).

14.   **Claim 1** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system that employs a shared access profile to interact with a networked device, [Schaeck, paragraph [0020]] comprising:

- a storage component that is utilized to save one or more access profiles; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] and [0067]]

- a retrieval component that obtains the shared access profile from the storage component, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] and

- a user interface that employs the shared access profile to provide the user with selective access to the networked device" [Schaeck, paragraph [0044] with Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]].

15.   **Claim 2** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile associated with a user role" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] and [0067]].

16.   **Claim 3** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile is a default or a user customized profile" [Schaeck, paragraph [0068]].

17.   **Claim 4** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the shared access profile is associated with one or more attributes comprising a read, a write and an execute attribute" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0081], [0066], [0073], and [0075]-[0076]].

18.   **Claim 8** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated within the user interface wherein

the user can toggle between instances or partition the user interface to concurrently view more than one instance" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

19.   **Claim 9** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, multiple instances of the shared access profile are instantiated by a plurality of users with the user role within the user interface and/or other user interfaces" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

20.   **Claim 10** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, the user interface is a portal with one or more portlets" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0033]-[0034], [0037], [0044]].

21.   **Claim 11** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 1, employed in an industrial environment" [Schaeck, paragraph [0068]].

22.   **Claim 12** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system that provides a user with access to components on a network, [Schaeck, paragraph [0020]] comprising:

- a loading component that launches a shared portal configuration associated with a user role, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0022] with Schaeck, paragraph [0044] with Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] and

- one or more portlets that are respectively associated with the networked components, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0033]-[0034], [0037], [0044]] the portlets reside within the portal [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]] and provide the user with access to the components based on the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068] with Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

23.   **Claim 13** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, the shared portal configuration is concurrently utilized by one or more users associated with the user role" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]].

24.   **Claim 14** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, further comprising a utility to modify and save the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraph [0066]].

25.   **Claim 16** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, further comprising intelligence to automatically select and load the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

26.   **Claim 17** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 16, the intelligence utilizes at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference and a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration for the user" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

27.   **Claim 20** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 12, the portal is a graphical user interface including one of a web browser, a web page and a home page" [Schaeck, paragraph [0073] with Schaeck, paragraph [0006]].

28.   **Claim 21** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A method for employing a shared portal configuration, [Schaeck, paragraph [0020]] comprising:

- selecting a shared portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]]

- loading the shared portal configuration to instantiate one or more portlets within the portal; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- associating the one or more portlets with respective networked components, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], and [0076]] and

- employing the one or more portlets to access the networked components" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], and [0076]].

29.   **Claim 22** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 21, the shared portal configuration selected from a set of shared configurations that are associated with a user role" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068], and [0080]].

30.   **Claim 24** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The system of claim 21, further comprising employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inferences and a classifier to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

31.   **Claim 26** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A method for customizing and saving a shared portal configuration, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]] comprising:

- logging on to a portal; [Schaeck, paragraphs, [0081], [0059], [0067], and [0006]]

- initializing a portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- customizing the portal configuration, based on a user role [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- defining the portal configuration as a shared configuration, [Schaeck, paragraph [0073]] and

- saving the portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-[0068]].

32.   **Claim 27** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, the initialized portal configuration is an existing configuration or a new configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-[0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]].

33.   **Claim 28** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further customizing the configuration by at least one of adding, removing and editing portlets" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0073], and [0080]].

34.   **Claim 30** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further customizing the configuration by associating networked components with the portlets" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]].

35.   **Claim 31** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, saving the shared configuration to at least one of a storage location local to the portal, a common storage location on the network and a storage location associated with another portal" [Schaeck, paragraph [0066] and [0081]].

36.   **Claim 32** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The method of claim 26, further comprising employing at least one of a statistic, a probability, an inference, Bayesian learning, a Bayesian classifier, decision tree learning, a support vector machine, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate customization" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0080], and [0082]].

37.   **Claim 33** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "A system for employing a
shared portal configuration to access components on a network, [Schaeck, paragraph
[0020]] comprising:

- means for selecting a shared portal configuration from one or more
  configurations associated with a user role; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053],
  [0066]-[0068], [0080], and [0082]]

- means for invoking the shared portal configuration, the invocation instantiating
  portlets [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]
  and associating networked components with the portlets; [Schaeck, paragraphs
  [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]] and

- means for employing the portlets to access the networked components, the
  networked components associated with the users role" [Schaeck, paragraphs
  [0037], [0044], and [0076]].

38.   **Claim 34** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "An API that generates a
shared portal configuration, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020] and [0034]] comprising:

- instantiating a portal configuration; [Schaeck, paragraphs [0020], [0053], [0066]-
  [0068], [0073], [0080], and [0082]]

- defining the portal configuration for a user role, [Schaeck, paragraphs [0066]-
  [0068]] and

- saving the portal configuration as a shared configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs
  [0066]-[0068] with [0073]].

39.   **Claim 35** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising utilizing a .NET or SDK API" [Schaeck, paragraph [0034]].

40.   **Claim 36** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising associating one or more of a read, a write and an execute attribute with the portal configuration" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0081], [0066], [0073], and [0075]-[0076]].

41.   **Claim 37** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 34, further comprising adding, removing and editing a portlet associated with the portal" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0080], [0073]-[0074], and [0043]].

42.   **Claim 38** can be mapped to Schaeck as follows: "The API of claim 37, further comprising associating a component with the portlet" [Schaeck, paragraphs [0037], [0044], [0073], [0075]-[0078], and [0080]-[0083]].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

43.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

44.   This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was

not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g)

prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

45.   Claims 5, 7, 19, 23, 29, 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et

al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.).

46.   For **Claim 5**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 1, further comprising."

        Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...an

update component that notifies the user when the shared access profile changes and

refreshes the user interface with the changed shared access profile upon a user

approval."

        With respect to Claim 5, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...an update

component that notifies the user when the shared access profile changes and refreshes

the user interface with the changed shared access profile upon a user approval" [Hayes

Jr., paragraph [0061]].

        It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed

towards profiles and portals.

        Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck

discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck

does not expressly disclose notification of a changed to the shared access profile with automatic refreshing. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising notification and allowing automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification and allowance of automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

47.   For **Claim 7**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 1."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the shared access profile is automatically updated in the user interface when the shared access profile is modified."

With respect to Claim 7, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...the shared access profile is automatically updated in the user interface when the shared access profile is modified" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr.

discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

48.   For **Claim 19**, Schaeck teaches: "The system of claim 12."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the shared portal configuration is dynamically refreshed when modified."

With respect to Claim 19, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...the shared portal configuration is dynamically refreshed when modified" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server

application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a

context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention

of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that

everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

49.   For **Claim 23**, Schaeck teaches: "The method of claim 21."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the

shared portal configuration re-loads within the portal when a change occurs to the

shared portal configuration."

With respect to Claim 23, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...the shared

portal configuration re-loads within the portal when a change occurs to the shared portal

configuration" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0061]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed

towards profiles and portals.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Schaeck's invention because both inventions use profiles and portals. Schaeck

discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck

does not expressly disclose automatic refreshing when a profile is modified. Hayes Jr.

discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server

application user access permissions comprising automatic refreshing when there is a

context change.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to take the automatic refreshing from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention

of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of updating portals/portlets so that

everyone has the most recent/correct data/views.

50.   For **Claim 29**, Schaeck teaches: "The method of claim 26."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...further

customizing the configuration by defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color,

rotation, location and opacity."

With respect to Claim 29, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...further

customizing the configuration by defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color,

rotation, location and opacity" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0044]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of

invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed

towards portals and portlets.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with

Schaeck's invention because both inventions use portals and portlets. Schaeck

discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck

does not expressly disclose defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation,

location and opacity. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a

user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising defining portlet background color.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the portlet background color definition from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of customizing the portlet according to user preferences.

51.   For **Claim 39**, Schaeck teaches: "The API of claim 34, further comprising."

Schaeck discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity."

With respect to Claim 39, an analogous art, Hayes Jr., teaches: "...defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity" [Hayes Jr., paragraph [0044]].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Hayes Jr. with Schaeck because both inventions are directed towards portals and portlets.

Hayes Jr.'s invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck's invention because both inventions use portals and portlets. Schaeck discloses providing role-based views from business web portals, however Schaeck does not expressly disclose defining at least one of portlet shape, size, color, rotation, location and opacity. Hayes Jr. discloses a client-server system from maintaining a user desktop consistent with server application user access permissions comprising defining portlet background color.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the portlet background color definition from Hayes Jr. and install it into the invention of Schaeck, thereby offering the obvious advantage of customizing the portlet according to user preferences.

52.   Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,813,007 (Nielsen).

53.   For **Claim 6**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 5."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the notification comprising at least one of a text message and an audio message."

With respect to Claim 6, an analogous art, Nielsen, teaches: "...the notification comprising at least one of a text message and an audio message" [Nielsen, col. 10, lines 45-55].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Nielsen with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards user notification.

Nielsen's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use

notifications. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising notifying the user of a context change to allow a refresh to occur, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose a text or audio notification. Nielsen discloses automatic updates of bookmarks in a client computer comprising dialog notification/indication to a user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the notification technique from Nielsen and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of allowing the refresh to occur after the dialog notification.

54.   Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,709 (Gilmour et al.).

55.   For **Claim 15**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 14."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the utility defines an attribute for the shared portal configuration comprising one of a hide and a share attribute."

With respect to Claim 15, an analogous art, Gilmour, teaches: "...the utility defines an attribute for the shared portal configuration comprising one of a hide and a share attribute" [Gilmour, col. 17, lines 55-65 with Gilmour, col. 18, lines 45-65].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Gilmour with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards sharing (public) or hiding (private) profile data.

Gilmour's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use public and private data. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising shared portal configurations, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose an attribute that designates if it is shared or hidden. Gilmour discloses a method and system for constructing a knowledge profile of a user having unrestricted and restricted access portions according to respective levels of confidence of content of the portions comprising sections of profiles designated as public (shared) or private (hide) by use of a private flag (attribute).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the private flag from Gilmour and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of restricting access to shared configuration files, not making them shared.

56.   Claims 18 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0163513 (Schaeck et al.) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0011341 (Hayes Jr. et al.), further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,026,397 (Sheppard).

57.   For **Claim 18**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 16."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "...the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network."

With respect to Claim 18, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: "...the intelligence comprises one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network" [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use computers. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising programmatic code for selection of the role of a user, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of having a greater chance of selecting the correct associated role of a user, error in role selection is implied in Schaeck, paragraph [0067].

58.   For **Claim 25**, Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) teaches: "The system of claim 21, further comprising."

Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses the above limitation but does not expressly teach: "…employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration."

With respect to Claim 25, an analogous art, Sheppard, teaches: "…employing one or more of a Bayesian learning model, a Bayesian classifier, a decision tree learning model, a support vector machines, a linear regression, a non-linear regression and a neural network to facilitate selecting the shared portal configuration" [Sheppard, col. 23, lines 8-11].

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine Sheppard with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) because both inventions are directed towards analyzing data using a computer in the process of selection.

Sheppard's invention would have been expected to successfully work well with Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.)'s invention because both inventions use computers. Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) discloses providing role-based views from business web portals comprising programmatic code for selection of the role of a user, however Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.) does not expressly disclose using a neural network for intelligence in selecting. Sheppard discloses a data analysis system and method comprising analyzing data using a neural network on a computer.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to take the neural network from Sheppard and install it into the invention of Schaeck (as modified by Hayes Jr.), thereby offering the obvious advantage of having a greater chance of selecting the correct associated role of a user, error in role selection is implied in Schaeck, paragraph [0067].

Conclusion

59.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is advised that, although not used in the rejections above, prior art cited on the PTO-892 form and not relied upon is considered materially relevant to the applicant's claimed invention and/or portions of the claimed invention.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brent S. Stace whose telephone number is 571-272-8372 and fax number is 571-273-8372. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Brent Stace

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

BS